United Nations A/C.4/65/SR.7

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 November 2010

Original: English

Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

Summary record of the 7th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 11 October 2010, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Chipaziwa ..... (Zimbabwe)
later: Mr. Flisiuk ..... (Poland)
later: Mr. Chipaziwa ..... (Zimbabwe)

Contents

Agenda item 55: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 56: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 57: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 58: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 59: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other items*) (*continued*)*

* Items which the Committee has decided to consider together.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

10-57400 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.06 a.m.

Agenda item 55: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*) (A/65/23 and Corr.1, chaps. VII and XII, and A/65/66)

Agenda item 56: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*) (A/65/23 and Corr.1, chaps. V and XII)

Agenda item 57: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*) (A/65/23 and Corr.1, chaps. VI and XII, A/65/61 and Corr.1)

Agenda item 58: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*) (A/65/67)

Agenda item 59: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other items*) (*continued*) (A/65/23 and Corr.1, chaps. VIII, IX, X, XI and XII, A/65/306 and A/65/330)

1. **Mr. Wolfe** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), said that when General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted in 1960, all of the CARICOM member States had been listed as Non-Self-Governing Territories. Many of them had since achieved decolonization through the active support of the United Nations, however, six of the remaining 16 Non-Self-Governing Territories were members of CARICOM. Their non-self-governing status constituted an obstacle to regional integration of the Caribbean, making decolonization an urgent priority.

2. As the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism drew to an end, CARICOM was deeply concerned that although some internal reforms had been enacted in several Non-Self-Governing Territories, little progress had been made in actual decolonization. CARICOM supported the designation of a Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, but believed that it was important to identify what had prevented the United Nations from achieving the established targets; the challenges included an information deficit on decolonization, compounded by a lack of analysis on the constitutional, political and economic situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, as well as a limited high-level focus on the decolonization agenda. The annual endorsements of Member States for the principles of self-determination and decolonization were not sufficient without action on the corresponding mandates. The Third Decade presented an opportunity to take concrete steps, including full implementation of all relevant resolutions.

3. CARICOM noted with deep regret the regressive steps recently undertaken in the Turks and Caicos Islands, which included decisions by the administering Power to dissolve the Government and legislature, postpone the elections scheduled for 2011, suspend the right to trial by jury and replace the elected Government with direct rule. The imposition of direct rule was an obstacle to the development of good governance, including improved fiscal and administrative management in the Territory, which could not be achieved by denying the inalienable right of the people of Turks and Caicos to shape their own future. He called for direct rule to be replaced by self rule and for a return to democracy in the Turks and Caicos Islands, which was an associate member of CARICOM.

4. CARICOM maintained its principled support for the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination; it commended the work of the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy to Western Sahara, which had resulted in the re-establishment of dialogue between the parties to the dispute, and urged the quick resumption of family visits by air and the commencement of family visits by land. It hoped that the upcoming informal talks would lead to more substantive negotiations with the objective of achieving a lasting and mutually acceptable solution. CARICOM supported the call to the parties, in Security Council resolution 1920 (2010), to continue negotiations without preconditions and in good faith, with a view to achieving a solution which would provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara.

5. **Ms. Ojiambo** (Kenya) stressed the importance of establishing achievable benchmarks for the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. She encouraged the Special Committee on decolonization to pursue genuine dialogue aimed at finding fresh, concrete and more creative ways to

eradicate colonialism. The administering Powers must cooperate by ensuring that United Nations visiting and special missions to the Territories received the necessary assistance and support, and by regularly transmitting information on conditions in the Territories for which they were responsible, taking into consideration their obligation to promote the socio-economic and educational advancement of the peoples of those Territories and to protect their natural resources. She also urged the administering Powers to fully implement the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization concerning the restitution of cultural property to the rightful owners still living under colonial occupation.

6. On the question of Western Sahara, Kenya supported continued negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General, taking into account the efforts made since 2006 and recent developments. That was the only way to achieve a just, lasting and mutually acceptable solution.

7. **Mr. Mahant** (India) said that the fact that the United Nations continued to grapple with the vestiges of colonialism after 65 years reflected poorly on all Member States. As the international community marked the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and as the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism came to an end, there was a need to assess the progress achieved and review the methods followed with a view to attaining the remaining goals as a matter of urgency. It was critical to ascertain the political aspirations of the people in each Territory and to take into account the stage of development of each Territory. It was encouraging that many of the Territories had formed functional institutions that could thrive on their own. The administering Powers must work with the Special Committee in a spirit of cooperation and flexibility.

8. His delegation welcomed the Special Committee's efforts to disseminate information on legitimate political options available to the people in the Territories. The Pacific Regional Seminar held in New Caledonia in May 2009 was a step in the right direction. India also took note of the recommendations made by the Special Committee in its report to the General Assembly (A/65/23), including the recommendation on the launching of the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

9. India's poverty eradication programmes, such as the Mahatma Gandhi national rural employment guarantee scheme, were aimed at ensuring inclusive growth so that the benefits of development would reach every section of society and the residual vestiges of colonialism, which exacerbated societal divisions and disadvantage, would be eliminated.

10. The State of Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part of India and the people of Jammu and Kashmir had regularly exercised their franchise in elections conducted in a free and fair manner.

11. **Mr. Shalgham** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that although more than two thirds of Member States had achieved independence since the establishment of the United Nations, millions of people still suffered under foreign occupation or colonialism. In particular, the Palestinian people continued to suffer under Zionist colonialism, which was the worst form of the phenomenon. Palestinians living under occupation faced house demolitions, land confiscation and ethnic cleansing as Zionist settlement construction continued unabated.

12. The international community must stand firm against foreign troops being stationed in the territory of another country. That constituted a new form of colonialism. Other forms of colonialism that must be immediately brought to an end included the imposition of cultural hegemony over other peoples and the exploitation of their natural resources.

13. Colonized countries had been severely damaged. Their inhabitants' lives were threatened, and they faced, inter alia, mass expulsions, slavery and the eradication of their languages and cultures. Moreover, hundreds of thousands were conscripted into the armies of colonial Powers. Colonized countries also suffered from economic exploitation and major environmental degradation, sometimes as a result of atomic tests. There was no doubt that colonialism had contributed to the socio-economic woes faced by most peoples in Africa. As a result, millions of Africans risked their lives to emigrate to those rich countries that had colonized their homelands. In order to foster international cooperation, it was urgent that colonized peoples received an apology as well as just compensation, so as to enable them to establish literacy programmes, combat poverty and fight disease. Such

steps would also help stem the tide of illegal migration from poor to rich countries.

14. **Mr. Sangqu** (South Africa), acknowledging the invaluable contribution made by the Committee, and in particular by the Special Committee against Apartheid, said that it was regrettable that on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization, the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, the last remaining colony in Africa, remained perpetually deferred. His delegation supported the proposal to declare the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

15. South Africa remained concerned at Morocco's illegal occupation of Western Sahara, which undermined the integrity of the United Nations. It supported the ongoing negotiation process and encouraged all parties to negotiate in good faith in line with Security Council resolution 1920 (2010). His Government remained committed to the African Union position in support of the holding of a referendum to enable the people of Western Sahara to choose between the option of independence and that of integration into the Kingdom of Morocco. The Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic, as a member of the African Union, would continue to be encouraged to seek a political solution to the issue of self-determination.

16. His delegation was concerned about the deterioration of the human rights situation in Western Sahara and in particular about violations perpetrated under the guise of counter-terrorism activities. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights should investigate those violations and the Security Council should mandate the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) to monitor human rights violations in Western Sahara. His delegation was also concerned at the alleged illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Western Sahara.

17. Capacity-building was a crucial element of decolonization in Western Sahara. In that context, his Government had provided executive training to senior officials of the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic, with a view to assisting them in the areas of preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution so as to enhance the ability of the Frente Polisario to maintain a peaceful approach towards the solution of their problems.

18. **Mr. Morejón** (Ecuador) said that decolonization must remain a matter of priority in the United Nations. He urged the administering Powers to cooperate fully in transmitting adequate information on each of the Territories for which they were responsible, in line with Article 73 of the Charter. Ecuador reiterated its support for the legitimate rights of Argentina in the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands. The President of Ecuador had affirmed that position in a recent meeting of the Union of South American Nations, at which a declaration had been approved calling for a peaceful resolution of the sovereignty dispute in line with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the Organization of American States. His delegation denounced the exploration for non-renewable natural resources being conducted along the continental shelf of Argentina by the United Kingdom, in violation of General Assembly resolution 31/49.

19. After more than a century of colonialism by the United States of America, the people of Puerto Rico continued to struggle to exercise their legitimate right to independence and self-determination. As a proponent of peaceful coexistence and the right of self-determination, Ecuador once again called for the issue of Puerto Rico to be considered in all of its aspects by the General Assembly, in line with numerous resolutions.

20. His delegation reiterated its full support for the Sahrawi people and their right of self-determination. It commended the work of the Personal Envoy and urged the parties to cooperate with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in order to resume family visits by air and initiate family visits by road.

21. **Mr. Sipangule** (Zambia) said that his delegation supported the proposal to declare a Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism; it was regrettable that at the end of the Second International Decade, the process of decolonization was still incomplete. The Committee had a responsibility to ensure that as it commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization, the international community reaffirmed its commitment to the decolonization of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Western Sahara. In that regard, his delegation reaffirmed its support for the African Union and United Nations plans on Western Sahara, with a view to achieving a just, lasting and a mutually acceptable solution.

22. **Mr. Benmehidi** (Algeria), said that Algeria knew well the price of achieving liberation from colonialism and accordingly, firmly supported the right to self-determination of the people of the Territories that were still under colonial domination or foreign occupation. Algeria was gratified that the people of Timor-Leste had been able to exercise their right to self-determination, but regretted that 16 Non-Self-Governing Territories remained on the decolonization agenda of the United Nations. His delegation therefore endorsed the recommendation to declare the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

23. The people of Western Sahara were still waiting to be able to exercise their right to self-determination. The African States had consistently worked for the full restoration of their rights; the African Union in declaring the year 2010 as the African Year of Peace, had appealed for the intensification of efforts towards the holding of a referendum to enable the people of Western Sahara to choose between the option of independence and that of integration into the Kingdom of Morocco. He wished to reaffirm Algeria's solidarity with the courageous people of Western Sahara and its unwavering support for the restoration of all their legitimate rights, including the right freely to choose their destiny by means of a referendum that would enable them to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

24. The United Nations must fulfil its responsibility towards the people of Western Sahara. Security Council resolution 1754 (2007), entailed according equal attention to the proposals of the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Polisario. While the first four rounds of talks had focused on different interpretations of the purpose of the negotiations, those differences were in no way unsurmountable, given that both parties had initially subscribed to the objective of achieving a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution that would allow the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. Algeria had participated in the formal and informal talks as an observer and as a neighbouring State. It would continue to contribute towards improving the atmosphere in the negotiations between the two parties to the conflict and supported the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy in their efforts to promote a mutually acceptable solution. His Government remained committed to supporting confidence-building measures, which should be extended to include monitoring of the human rights situation by means of an appropriate United Nations mechanism in order to ensure respect by each of the parties of its obligations and to verify alleged violations in a spirit of cooperation. Algeria was determined to act in concert with its neighbours to relaunch the process of building peace, stability, unity and prosperity throughout the Maghreb region.

25. **Mr. Rugunda** (Uganda) said that the fact that on the fiftieth anniversary of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), there were still over 2 million people living under occupation in 16 Non-Self-Governing Territories constituted a blot on the universal freedom, values and rights that were cherished by the international community and should be enjoyed by all people. It was unfortunate that at the end of the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, not much progress had been achieved. His delegation reaffirmed its unequivocal support for the exercise by the peoples living under colonial rule of their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter and all relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions. Uganda called on all the administering Powers to cooperate fully with the Special Committee with a view to achieving tangible progress as soon as possible.

26. Western Sahara remained the only member of the African Union that had yet to gain its independence. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the United Nations had consistently recognized the inalienable right of the Sahrawi people to self-determination. In addition, the Security Council, in resolution 690 (1991) had expressed its full support for the organization of a referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. His delegation reaffirmed all Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1920 (2010), which called upon parties to show political will and enter into more substantive negotiations While his delegation commended the ongoing efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy, it noted that not much progress had been achieved. It was unacceptable that after more than two decades, the Sahrawi people were still denied the right to determine their own destiny. His delegation was deeply concerned about human rights violations in Western Sahara and called for a mechanism for the monitoring of human rights, either by MINURSO or by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. It urged Morocco,

the occupying Power, to engage in constructive negotiations that would pave the way for the holding of a referendum on self-determination and reiterated its concern about the continued illegal exploitation of the resources of Western Sahara.

27. **Mr. Loulichki** (Morocco) said that over the past two days the Committee had heard from impartial petitioners of diverse backgrounds and authentic representatives of the Sahara population, who had described the efforts made by Morocco since 1975 to address long-standing deficiencies in infrastructure and in economic, social and cultural development, enabling the southern provinces of Morocco to achieve almost all the Millennium Development Goals. Most Sahrawis had remained in Morocco where, along with the thousands who had joined them, they were exercising their political, civil, economic and socio-cultural rights and contributing to the prosperity of the region.

28. The current dispute had been triggered by greed over Morocco's recovery of its Sahara; that greed was disguised as a geographically selective attachment to the principle of self-determination. However, that principle, which Morocco itself had helped develop, had never been intended, and had never served, as an instrument for undermining the unity and integrity of States, or as a pretext for depriving States of integral parts of their territory, with a community of language, religion, traditions and culture, as was the case in Moroccan Sahara. It was on that basis that all the States of North Africa, including Algeria, had been able to keep the Saharan part of their national territory; when Algeria, on the eve of its independence, had been threatened by a last colonial attempt to amputate it from its Sahara, Morocco had provided support to the point of refusing to negotiate with the colonial Power on the demarcation of the Moroccan-Algerian borders, preferring to negotiate with independent Algeria, which was well aware of the injustices committed against Morocco and the successive annexations of its territory. It was precisely to ward off the threat of secession that the Declaration on decolonization provided that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter; and, along with General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), emphasized the importance of the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned. Accordingly, Morocco had explicitly included in its autonomy initiative the requirement of consultation with the population of the Sahara. His Government had ensured that the autonomy initiative enjoyed national legitimacy by involving representatives of the population and from across the political spectrum in its formulation and then seeking international recognition through consultations with partners in the region. As a result, the Security Council had commended the initiative and the efforts made by Morocco in that regard.

29. Morocco continued to negotiate in good faith, and was determined to ensure that negotiations were successful. However, a range of tactics had been used to undermine the fragile negotiating process, and a plethora of baseless allegations had been made as a smokescreen to conceal the true intentions of their instigators. Morocco, however, had launched an extensive process of reforms in the areas of human rights and governance which were benefiting all Moroccans and the entire territory, and no one could tarnish its image by means of lies and slander.

30. The current dispute could not last forever, particularly in view of the human cost for the populations living in makeshift camps. However, it could not be resolved while the borders between Morocco and Algeria remained closed, in defiance of the shared history of the two countries. The dispute must be resolved through dialogue and negotiation, with a view to building a common future of peace and prosperity. Moreover, Morocco aspired to the formation of a strong and coherent regional grouping in the Maghreb, along the lines of what had been achieved in Europe.

31. Morocco welcomed the statement made at the plenary session by Algerian Minister for Foreign Affairs pledging full support to efforts by the United Nations to resolve the conflict. The Algerian Government must now fulfil that pledge by discharging all its obligations and responsibilities. At the political level, Algeria must engage fully in the ongoing negotiating process, instead of continuing to be a passive observer, and at the humanitarian level, it must fulfil its duty towards the population of the Tindouf camps by allowing UNHCR to conduct a census. Algeria must rescind its unilateral decision to close its borders with Morocco.

32. Morocco aspired to a united Maghreb, based on respect for territorial integrity, reconciliation and a sincere commitment to build an economically and

politically strong Maghreb that was able to deal with the security threats on its borders. It had made the strategic choice of negotiations to achieve that goal and firmly believed that the only way to solve the dispute once and for all was on the basis of a win-win approach. Morocco urged the other parties to commit themselves in good faith and to demonstrate a spirit of compromise and realism. It hoped that the Committee would once again express support for the negotiating process and urge the other parties to engage in that process in a genuine, concrete and sustained manner in the interests of peace and stability both in the Maghreb and throughout the African continent.

Rights of reply

33. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, and responding to the statement by the representative of India, said that Jammu and Kashmir was not and had never been an integral part of India and had been recognized as disputed territory in several Security Council resolutions. No electoral exercise conducted in Jammu and Kashmir by India could substitute for a free and impartial plebiscite as mandated by the Security Council.

34. *Mr. Flisiuk (Vice-Chairperson) took the Chair.*

35. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom), responding to the statement made by the representative of Jamaica on behalf of the CARICOM countries, said that since August 2009, much progress had been made to reform and embed the principles of sound financial management and good governance across the structures and Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands. His Government did not wish to postpone elections in the Islands any longer than necessary; the United Kingdom Minister of State for the Overseas Territories had indicated that he would issue a statement by the end of 2010 setting out the remaining milestones which must be met before elections could be held. Extensive public consultations on constitutional reform had been undertaken in the Territory by an independent constitutional and electoral reform adviser. His Government, and the Governor, had encouraged all sectors of society to take part in those consultations, which provided an opportunity for the views of all the people of the Territory to be made known to his Government. The consultations would facilitate the formulation of a new constitution which would help a future democratically elected government of the Turks and Caicos Islands to remain on a sound financial footing and exercise good governance.

36. Responding to the representatives of Argentina and Ecuador, he said that the United Kingdom had no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands. There could be no negotiations on the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands unless and until such time as the islanders so wished. His Government attached great importance to the principle of self-determination as set out in the United Nations Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Democratically elected representatives of the Falkland Islands had recently addressed the Special Committee and had reiterated the historical facts that the Falkland Islands had no indigenous people and that no civilian population had been removed prior to their people settling the Islands over eight generations ago. They wished the status of the Islands to remain unchanged. The Government of the Falkland Islands was, moreover, entitled to develop a hydrocarbons industry within its territorial waters in accordance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

37. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said, in reply to the United Kingdom representative, that his Government considered that the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia Islands, the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were an integral part of Argentine territory and that, having been illegally occupied by the United Kingdom, they were the subject of a sovereignty dispute between the two countries, as had been recognized repeatedly in successive General Assembly and Special Committee resolutions, all of which had urged the two Governments to resume negotiations in order to find a peaceful, lasting solution to the dispute. That position had also been endorsed by the Organization of American States. Argentina reaffirmed its legitimate rights of national sovereignty over the territories in question.

38. **Ms. Lalama** (Ecuador), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed support for Argentina's position. The United Kingdom had failed to comply with General Assembly resolution 31/49.

39. **Mr. Ravindra** (India), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he rejected in their entirety the untenable comments of the representative of Pakistan.

40. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Security Council, in resolution 91 (1951), had rejected the authority of the

constituent assembly formed by India in occupied Kashmir to decide on the future of the state of Jammu and Kashmir and had reminded the parties that the final disposition of the state was to be made in accordance with the will of its people. Furthermore, in resolution 122 (1957), the Security Council had declared that the convening of a constituent assembly and any action that assembly might take would not constitute a disposition of the state of Jammu and Kashmir in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations. Pakistan therefore believed that the points it had raised were tenable and accorded with United Nations resolutions.

41. *Mr. Chipaziwa (Zimbabwe) resumed the Chair.*

42. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolutions and the draft decision under agenda items 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59, none of which had any programme budget implications.

Draft resolution I on information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted under item 55 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

43. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

44. *Draft resolution I was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.**

45. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom) said that as in previous years, the United Kingdom had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. His Government did not take issue with the main objective of the draft resolution, which was to seek compliance with Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations, and would continue to meet its obligations fully in that regard in respect of the United Kingdom Overseas Territories. It believed, however, that the decision as to whether a Non-Self-Governing Territory had reached a level of self-government sufficient to relieve the administering Power of the obligation to submit information under Article 73 *e* of the Charter ultimately fell to the Government of the Territory and the administering Power concerned, and not to the General Assembly.

Draft resolution II on economic and other activities, submitted under item 56 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

46. *A recorded vote was taken.*

* The delegation of Bolivia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

47. *Draft resolution II was adopted by 146 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.**

* The delegation of Bolivia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

48. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), said that draft resolution II must be interpreted within the framework of resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly on decolonization. Accordingly, the applicability of the draft resolution to a specific Territory depended on whether the right to self-determination was relevant to that Territory. The exercise of the right of self-determination presupposed an active subject, in the form of a people subject to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as required by paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were illegally occupied by the United Kingdom, which had expelled the local population of the islands and replaced it with its own population. That meant that the right of self-determination was inapplicable to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

49. All of the General Assembly resolutions on the issue, in particular resolution 2065 (XX), as well as the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee, had expressly established that, owing to the existence of a sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, the way to put an end to that special and particular colonial situation was not through self-determination, but through a negotiated settlement of the sovereignty dispute between the only two parties: the United Kingdom and Argentina. Furthermore, the General Assembly had expressly ruled out the applicability of the principle of self-determination in regard to the Malvinas Islands in 1985 when it had rejected by a large majority two proposals by the United Kingdom seeking to incorporate that principle into a draft resolution on the question. The draft resolution was therefore in no way applicable to the question of the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia Islands, the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas.

50. The General Assembly, in resolution 31/49, had called upon Argentina and the United Kingdom to refrain from taking decisions that would imply introducing unilateral modifications in the situation while the Islands were going through the negotiating process recommended by the General Assembly. The unilateral and illegal exploration and exploitation by the United Kingdom of the natural renewable and non-renewable resources of Argentina in the Malvinas

Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were therefore in open violation of that specific pronouncement of the United Nations.

Draft resolution III on implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies and international institutions, submitted under item 57 (A/64/23, chap. XII)

51. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

52. *Draft resolution III was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 51 abstentions.**

53. **Ms. Deman** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that while it supported assistance by the specialized agencies to Non-Self-Governing Territories in educational, humanitarian and technical fields, the European Union considered that the agency mandates must be scrupulously observed, and for that reason it had abstained in the vote.

54. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the draft resolution had to be implemented in accordance with the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee relevant to each specific Territory.

Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.3 on offers by Member States for study and training facilities, submitted under item 58

55. **The Chairperson** announced that Thailand had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.3 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.4 on the question of Gibraltar, submitted under item 59.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.4 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.5 on the question of Western Sahara, submitted under item 59

58. *Draft resolution A/C.4/65/L.5 was adopted.*

59. **Ms. Deman** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union; the candidate country Croatia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro; and, in addition, Liechtenstein, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that those

* The delegation of Bolivia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

delegations welcomed the consensus adoption of the draft resolution on the question of Western Sahara. The European Union reaffirmed its full support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Envoy to achieve a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution that provided for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. It encouraged the parties to work towards such a solution within the framework of the United Nations. It fully supported the negotiations and the informal meetings convened by the Personal Envoy in preparation for the launch of the fifth round of negotiations, which it hoped would enter into a more intensive phase and be held in good faith and without preconditions, cognizant of efforts and developments since 2006, and thus ensuring the implementation of recent Security Council resolutions. The European Union remained concerned about the implications of the Western Sahara conflict for security and cooperation in the region. It encouraged the parties to collaborate with UNHCR in the implementation of confidence-building measures, such as the family visits programme, that would improve the atmosphere for the political process.

Draft resolution IV on the question of New Caledonia, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

60. **The Chairperson** recalled that the draft resolution had been orally revised by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee at the previous meeting.

61. **Mr. Nayasi** (Fiji), speaking in explanation of position, said that he supported the draft resolution as revised because it reflected the modest progress that had been made since the previous year with regard to New Caledonia. Fiji commended the stakeholders, including the administering Power and the Special Committee, for their continued cooperation, which was necessary to ensure the successful decolonization of the Territory.

62. *Draft resolution IV, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution V on the question of Tokelau, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

63. *Draft resolution V was adopted.*

64. **Mr. Aimee** (Saint Lucia) thanked the French and New Zealand Governments for their cooperation as administering Powers. They were showing what could be done, and others should follow their lead. His Government was extremely pleased that decolonization in both New Caledonia and Tokelau was continuing at a pace acceptable to all.

Draft resolution VII on dissemination of information on decolonization, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

65. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

France.

66. *Draft resolution VII was adopted by 143 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.**

67. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it considered that the obligation placed on the Secretariat to publicize decolonization issues represented an unwarranted drain on the scarce resources of the United Nations.

68. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said that Argentina expressed its firm support for the right of self-determination of the peoples subjected to colonial domination and foreign occupation, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). Nevertheless, draft resolution VII must be interpreted and implemented in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), all resolutions on the question of the Malvinas Islands had explicitly defined it as a special and particular colonial situation in that it involved a sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia Islands and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas between two sole parties, Argentina and the United Kingdom. All the resolutions established that the way to settle the dispute was through the resumption of the bilateral negotiations in order to find without delay a just, peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute, taking into account the interests of the population of the Islands.

Draft resolution VIII on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

69. *A recorded vote was requested.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Belgium, France.

70. *Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 149 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.**

* The delegation of Bolivia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

* The delegation of Algeria subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

71. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom), said that his delegation continued to find some elements of the draft resolution unacceptable, and had therefore voted against it. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom remained committed to modernizing its relationship with its Overseas Territories, while fully taking into account the views of the peoples of those Territories.

72. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), referring to paragraph 7 of draft resolution VIII, recalled that visiting missions could only be sent to Territories to which the right to self-determination applied, meaning Territories where there was no dispute over sovereignty. That requirement was fully in line with General Assembly resolution 850 (IX), which also established the requirement that any visiting mission must be approved by the General Assembly.

Draft resolution IX on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

73. *A recorded vote was requested.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

74. *Draft resolution IX was adopted by 150 votes to 3.*

75. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had voted against draft resolution IX as it failed to recognize the progress that had been made in the relationship between the United Kingdom and its Overseas Territories, which was now a modern relationship, based on partnership, shared values and the right of each Territory to determine whether it wished to retain the link to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom would support moves towards independence, where that was an option, if that was the clear and constitutionally expressed wish of the majority of people in the Territory concerned. The United Kingdom believed that the Special Committee and the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories were outdated and that none of its Overseas Territories should remain on that list.

76. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), said that the Declaration on decolonization should be implemented on a case-by-case basis, bearing in mind the political circumstances of each individual Territory, in conformity with the two ruling principles of the Declaration: self-determination and the territorial integrity of States. There were special cases in which the United Nations had wisely upheld the applicability of the right to maintain territorial integrity: one was the question of the Malvinas Islands, which involved a sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom over the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia

Islands, the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas. The fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration was an opportunity to recall that any vestige of colonialism was a crime violating the Charter, the Declaration and the principles of international law as set out in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV).

Draft resolution X on the Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, submitted under item 59 (A/65/23, chap. XII)

77. *A recorded vote was requested.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden.

78. *Draft resolution X was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 20 abstentions.*

79. **Mr. Shepherd** (United Kingdom), said that the United Kingdom had voted against the draft resolution because it could not accept the proposal for a Third International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. Moreover, the draft resolution failed to take into account the progress that had been made as the relationship between the United Kingdom and its Overseas Territories had been modernized, on the basis of partnership, shared values and the right of each Territory to determine whether it wished to retain the link to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom would support moves towards independence, where that was an option, if that was the clear and constitutionally expressed wish of the majority of people in the Territory concerned. The United Kingdom believed that the Special Committee and the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories were outdated and that none of its Overseas Territories should remain on that list. Moreover, some provisions of the draft resolution could necessitate the use of scarce United Nations resources, which should be devoted to more urgent issues.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.